arXiv:1509.08087v1 [math.AC] 27 Sep 2015

THE ZARISKI TOPOLOGY-GRAPH ON THE MAXIMAL SPECTRUM OF MODULES OVER COMMUTATIVE RINGS

HABIBOLLAH ANSARI-TOROGHY AND SHOKOOFEH HABIBI

Abstract. Let M be a module over a commutative ring and let $Spec(M)$ (resp. $Max(M)$) be the collection of all prime (resp. maximal) submodules of M. We topologize $Spec(M)$ with Zariski topology, which is analogous to that for $Spec(R)$, and consider $Max(M)$ as the induced subspace topology. For any non-empty subset T of $Max(M)$, we introduce a new graph $G(\tau_T^m)$, called the Zariski topology-graph on the maximal spectrum of M. This graph helps us to study the algebraic (resp. topological) properties of M (resp. $Max(M)$) by using the graph theoretical tools.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper R is a commutative ring with a non-zero identity and M is a unital R-module. By $N \leq M$ (resp. $N < M$) we mean that N is a submodule (resp. proper submodule) of M.

There are many papers on assigning graphs to rings or modules. Annihilating-ideal graphs of rings, first introduced and studied in [11], provide an excellent setting for studying the ideal structure of a ring. $AG(R)$, the Annihilating-ideal graph of R, to be a graph whose vertices are ideals of R with non-zero annihilators and in which two vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $IJ = 0$.

In [4], we generalized the above idea to submodules of M and define the (undirected) graph $AG(M)$, called *the annihilating submodule graph*, with vertices $V(AG(M))= \{N \leq M : \text{there exists } \{0\} \neq K < M \text{ with } NK = 0\}$, where NK, the product of N and K, is defined by $(N : M)(K : M)M$ (see [3]). In this graph, distinct vertices $N, L \in AG(M)$ are adjacent if and only if $NL = 0$. In section two of this article, we collect some fundamental properties of the annihilating-submodule graph of a module which will be used in this work.

A prime submodule (or a p-prime submodule) of M is a proper submodule P of M such that whenever $re \in P$ for some $r \in R$ and $e \in M$, either $e \in P$ or $r \in p$ [12].

The prime spectrum (or simply, the spectrum) of M is the set of all prime submodules of M and denoted by $Spec(M)$.

The *Zariski topology* on $Spec(M)$ is the topology τ_M described by taking the set $Z(M) = \{V(N) : N \leq M\}$ as the set of closed sets of $Spec(M)$, where $V(N) = \{P \in Spec(M) : (P : M) \supseteq (N : M)\}$ [15].

The closed subset $V(N)$, where N is a submodule of M, plays an important role in the Zariski topology on $Spec(M)$. In [4], We employed these sets and defined

Date: September 29, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13C13, 13C99, 05C75.

Key words and phrases. Zariski topology, maximal submodules, graph, Vertices, annihilating-submodule.

a new graph $G(\tau_T)$, called the *Zariski topology-graph*. This graph helps us to study algebraic (resp.topological) properties of modules (resp. Spec(M)) by using the graphs theoretical tools. $G(\tau_T)$ is an undirected graph with vertices $V(G(\tau_T)=\{N < M : \text{there exists } K < M \text{ such that } V(N)\cup V(K) = T \text{ and } V(N), V(K) \neq T\}$, where T is a non-empty subset of $Spec(M)$ and distinct vertices N and L are adjacent if and only if $V(N) \cup V(L) = T$.

There exists a topology on $Max(M)$ having $Z^m(M) = \{V^m(N) : N \leq M\}$ as the set of closed sets of $Max(M)$, where $V^m(N) = \{Q \in Max(M) : (Q : M) \supseteq (N : M)\}$. We denote this topology by τ_M^m. In fact τ_M^m is the same as the subspace topology induced by τ_M on $Max(M)$.

In this paper, we define a new graph $G(\tau_T^m)$, called the *Zariski topology-graph on the maximal spectrum of M*, where T is a non-empty subset of $Max(M)$, and by using this graph, we study algebraic (resp. topological) properties of M (resp. $Max(M)$). $G(\tau_T^m)$ is an undirected graph with vertices $V(G(\tau_T^m))= \{N < M :$ there exists a non-zero proper submodule L of M such that $V^m(N) \bigcup V^m(L) = T$ and $V^m(N), V^m(L) \neq T\}$, where T is a non-empty subset of $Max(M)$ and distinct vertices N and L are adjacent if and only if $V^m(N) \bigcup V^m(L) = T$.

Let T be a non-empty subset of $Max(M)$. As τ_M^m is the subspace topology induced by τ_M on $Max(M)$, one may think that $G(\tau_T)$ and $G(\tau_T^m)$ have the identical nature. But the Example 3.5 (case (1)) shows that this is not true and these graphs are different. Also the Example 3.5 (case (2)) shows that for a non-empty subset T' of $Spec(M)$, under a condition, $G(\tau_{T'})$ can be regarded as a subgraph of $G(\tau_T^m)$, where $T = T' \cap Max(M)$. Besides, this case denotes that $G(\tau_{T'})$ is not a subgraph of $G(\tau_T^m)$, necessarily. Moreover, it is shown that $G(\tau_T^m)$ can not appear as a subgraph of $G(\tau_{T'})$, where $T \subseteq T' \subseteq Spec(M)$, in general (see Example 3.5 (case (3)). So, the results related to $G(\tau_T^m)$, where T is a non-empty subset of $Max(M)$, do not go parallel to those of $G(\tau_{T'})$, where T' is a non-empty subset of $Spec(M)$, necessarily. Based on the above remarks, it is worth to study Max-graphs separately.

For any pair of submodules $N \subseteq L$ of M and any element m of M, we denote L/N and the residue class of m modulo N in M/N by $\overline{L}$ and $\overline{m}$ respectively.

For a submodule N of M, the *colon ideal of M into N* is defined by $(N : M) = \{r \in R : rM \subseteq N\} = Ann(M/N)$. Further if I is an ideal of R, the submodule $(N :_M I)$ is defined by $\{m \in M : Im \subseteq N\}$. Moreover, $\mathbb{Z}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Q}$) denotes the ring of integers (resp. the field of rational numbers).

The prime radical $\sqrt{N}$ is defined to be the intersection of all prime submodules of M containing N, and in case N is not contained in any prime submodule, $\sqrt{N}$ is defined to be M. Note that the intersection of all prime submodule M is denoted by $rad(M)$.

If $Max(M) \neq \emptyset$, the mapping $\psi : Max(M) \to Max(R/Ann(M)) = Max(\overline{R})$ such that $\psi(Q) = (Q : M)/Ann(M) = \overline{(Q : M)}$ for every $Q \in Max(M)$, is called the *natural map* of $Max(M)$ [9].

M is said to be *Max-surjective* if either $M = \mathbf{(0)}$ or $M \neq \mathbf{(0)}$ and the natural map of $Max(M)$ is surjective [9].

For a proper ideal I of R, we recall that the $J-radical$ I, denoted by $J^m(I)$, is the intersection of all maximal ideals containing I.
The $J-radical$ of a submodule N of M, denoted by $J^m(N)$, is the intersection of all members of $V^m(N)$. In case that $V^m(N) = \emptyset$, we define $J^m(N) = M$ [5].

A topological space X is said to be connected if there doesn't exist a pair U, V of disjoint non-empty open sets of X whose union is X. A topological space X is irreducible if for any decomposition $X = X_1 \bigcup X_2$ with closed subsets X_i of X with $i = 1, 2$, we have $X = X_1$ or $X = X_2$. A subset X' of X is connected (resp. irreducible) if it is connected (resp. irreducible) as a subspace of X.

In section 2, we briefly review some fundamental properties of the annihilating-submodule graph of a module needed later.

In section 3, among other results, it is shown that the *Zariski topology-graph on maximal Spectrum of* M , $G(\tau_T^m)$, is connected and $diam(G(\tau_T^m)) \leq 3$. Moreover, if $G(\tau_T^m)$ containing a cycle satisfies $gr(G(\tau_T^m)) \leq 4$ (see Theorem 3.6). Also we consider some conditions under which $G(\tau_T^m)$ is a non-empty graph.

In section 4, the relationship between $G(\tau_T^m)$ and $AG(M/\Im(T))$ is investigated, where $\Im(T)$ is the intersection of all members of T. It is proved that if M is a Max-surjective R-module and N and L are proper submodules of M which are adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$, then $J^m(N)/\Im(T)$ and $J^m(L)/\Im(T)$ are adjacent in $AG(M/\Im(T))$ (see Corollary 4.2). Also it is shown, under some conditions, that $AG(M/\Im(T))$ is isomorphic to a subgraph of $G(\tau_T^m)$ and $AG(M/\Im(T))$ is non-empty if and only if $G(\tau_T^m)$ is non-empty, and any two proper submodules N and L of M are adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$ if $N/\Im(T)$ and $L/\Im(T)$ are adjacent in $M/\Im(T)$ (see Proposition 4.3).

For completeness, we now mention some graph theoretic notions and notations that are used in this article. A graph G is an ordered triple $(V(G), E(G), \psi_G)$ consisting of a non-empty set of vertices, $V(G)$, a set $E(G)$ of edges, and an incident function ψ_G that associates an unordered pair of distinct vertices with each edge. The edge e joins x and y if $\psi_G(e) = \{x, y\}$, and we say x and y are adjacent. The degree $d_G(x)$ of a vertex x is the number of edges incident with x. A path in graph G is a finite sequence of vertices $\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, where x_{i-1} and x_i are adjacent for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and we denote $x_{i-1} - x_i$ for existing an edge between x_{i-1} and x_i. The number of edges crossed to get from x to y in a path is called the length of the path, where $x, y \in V(G)$. A graph G is connected if a path exists between any two distinct vertices. For distinct vertices x and y of G, let $d(x, y)$ be the length of the shortest path from x to y and if there is no such path $d(x, y) = \infty$. The diameter of G is $diam(G) = sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in V(G)\}$. The girth of G, denoted by $gr(G)$, is the length of a shortest cycle in G ($gr(G) = \infty$ if G contains no cycle)(see [1]).

A graph H is a subgraph of G if $V(H) \subseteq V(G)$, $E(H) \subseteq E(G)$ and ψ_H is the restriction of ψ_G to $E(H)$. Two graphs G and G' are said to be isomorphic if there exists a one-to-one and onto function $\phi : V(G) \to V(H)$ such that if $x, y \in V(G)$, then $x - y$ if and only if $\phi(x) - \phi(y)$. A bipartite graph is a graph whose vertices can be divided into two disjoint sets U and V such that every edge connects a vertex in U to one in V; that is, U and V are each independent sets and complete bipartite graph on n and m vertices, denoted by $K_{n,m}$, where V and U are of size n and m respectively, and $E(G)$ connects every vertex in V with all vertices in U (see [18]).

In the rest of this article, T denotes a non empty subset of $Max(M)$ and $\Im(T))$ is the intersection of all members of T.

2. Previous results

As we mentioned before, $AG(M)$ is a graph with vertices $V(AG(M)) = \{N \leq M : NL = 0 \text{ for some } \{0\} \neq L < M\}$, where distinct vertices N and L are adjacent

if and only if $NL = 0$ (here we recall that the product of N and L is defined by $(N : M)(L : M)M$) (see [4, Definition 3.1]).

The following results reflect some basic properties of the annihilating-submodule graph of a module.

Proposition A ([4, Proposition 3.2]). Let N be a non-zero proper submodule of M.

(a) N is a vertex in $AG(M)$ if $Ann(N) \neq Ann(M)$ or $(0 :_M (N : M)) \neq 0$.
(b) N is a vertex in $AG(M)$, where M is a multiplication module, if and only if $(0 :_M (N : M)) \neq 0$.

Remark 2.1. In the annihilating-submodule graph $AG(M)$, M itself can be a vertex. In fact M is a vertex if and only if every non-zero submodule is a vertex if and only if there exists a non-zero proper submodule N of M such that $(N : M) = Ann(M)$. For example, for every submodule N of $\mathbb{Q}$ (as $\mathbb{Z}$-module), $(N : \mathbb{Q}) = 0$. Hence $\mathbb{Q}$ is a vertex in $AG(\mathbb{Q})$.

Theorem B ([4, Theorem 3.3]). Assume that M is not a vertex. Then the following hold.

(a) $AG(M)$ is empty if and only if M is a prime module.
(b) A non-zero submodule N of M is a vertex if and only if $(0 :_M (N : M)) \neq 0$.

Theorem C ([4, Theorem 3.4]). The annihilating-submodule graph $AG(M)$ is connected and $diam(AG(M)) \leq 3$. Moreover, if $AG(M)$ contains a cycle, then $gr(AG(M)) \leq 4$.

Proposition D ([4, Proposition 3.5]). Let R be an Artinian ring and M a finitely generated R-module. Then every nonzero proper submodule N of M is a vertex in $AG(M)$.

Theorem E ([4, Theorem 3.6]). Suppose M is not a prime module. Then $AG(M)$ has acc (resp. dcc) on vertices if and only if M is a Noetherian (resp. an Artinian) module.

Theorem F ([4, Theorem 3.7]). Let R be a reduced ring and let M be a faithful module which is not prime. Then the following statements are equivalent.

(a) $AG(M)$ is a finite graph.
(b) M has only finitely many submodules.
(c) Every vertex of $AG(M)$ has finite degree. Moreover, $AG(M)$ has n ($n \geq 1$) vertices if and only if M has only n nonzero proper submodules.

Proposition G ([4, Proposition 3.9]). We have exactly one of the following assertions.

(a) Every non-zero submodule M is a vertex in $AG(M)$.
(b) There exists maximal ideal m of R such that $mM \in V(AG(M))$ if and only if $Soc(M) \neq 0$.

3. The Zariski topology-graph on the maximal spectrum module

Definition 3.1. We define $G(\tau_T^m)$, a *Zariski topology-graph on the maximal spectrum of M*, with vertices $V(G(\tau_T^m))$= $\{N < M$: there exists $L < M$ such that $V^m(N) \bigcup V^m(L) = T$ and $V^m(N), V^m(L) \neq T\}$, where T is a non-empty subset of $Max(M)$ and distinct vertices N and L are adjacent if and only if $V^m(N) \bigcup V^m(L) = T$.

Lemma 3.2. $G(\tau_T^m) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if T is closed and is not irreducible subset of $Max(M)$.

Proof. Let N and L be submodules of M. Since $V^m(N) = Max(M) \cup V(N)$, by [15, Result 3], we have $V^m(N) \cap V^m(L) = V^m(N \cup L) = V^m(NL)$ $(= V^{*m}(NL)$. Note that $V^{*m}(N) = \{P \in Max(M) : P \supseteq N\}$. Then for every submodules N and L of M, we have $V^{*m}(N) \cup V^{*m}(L) \subseteq V^{*m}(N \cup L))$. Hence, the proof is Straightforward. □

Remark 3.3. By [5, Lemma 3.5], T is closed if and only if $T = V^m(\Im(T))$. Hence $G(\tau_T^m) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $T = V^m(\Im(T))$ and T is not irreducible.

Remark 3.4. By [5, Theorem 3.13(a)], if M is a Max-surjective R-module, then $G(\tau_T^m) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $T = V^m(\Im(T))$ and $(\Im(T) : M)$ is not a J-radical prime ideal of R. If $Spec(M) = Max(M)$ and $G(\tau_T^m) \neq \emptyset$, then $T = V^m(\Im(T))$ and $\Im(T)$ is not a prime submodule of M by [15, Proposition 5.4].

Example 3.5. Consider the following examples.

case (1): Set $R := \mathbb{Z} \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}$. Then $Max(R) = \{\mathbb{Z} \bigoplus p_i\mathbb{Z}, p_i\mathbb{Z} \bigoplus \mathbb{Z} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $Spec(R) = Max(R) \cup \{(\mathbf{0}) \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z} \bigoplus (\mathbf{0})\}$.
In this example, we see that $G(\tau_{Max(R)})$ and $G(\tau^m_{Max(R)})$ are different. Because $I = (\mathbf{0}) \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}$ and $J = \mathbb{Z} \bigoplus (\mathbf{0})$ are not adjacent in $G(\tau_{Max(R)})$ but they are adjacent in $G(\tau^m_{Max(R)})$. In fact, $G(\tau_{Spec(R)})$ and $G(\tau^m_{Max(R)})$ are complete bipartite graphs with two parts $U = \{I \bigoplus (\mathbf{0})\}$ and $V = \{(\mathbf{0}) \bigoplus J\}$, where I and J are nonzero proper ideals of $\mathbb{Z}$.

case (2): Set $R := \mathbb{Q} \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}$. Then $Max(R) = \{\mathbb{Q} \bigoplus p_i\mathbb{Z} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $Spec(R) = Max(R) \cup \{(\mathbf{0}) \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q} \bigoplus (\mathbf{0})\}$.
In this example, we see that $G(\tau_{Spec(R)})$ is not a subgraph of $G(\tau^m_{Max(R)})$. Because $G(\tau_{Spec(R)})$ is a complete bipartite graph with two parts $U = \{I \bigoplus (\mathbf{0})\}$ and $V = \{(\mathbf{0}) \bigoplus J\}$, where I and J are non-zero proper ideals of $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Z}$, respectively and $G(\tau^m_{Max(R)})$ is an empty graph. In fact, for every non-empty subset T of $Spec(M)$, $G(\tau_T)$ is a subgraph of $G(\tau^m_{T'})$ (i.e., $V(G(\tau_T)) \subseteq V(G(\tau^m_{T'}))$ and $E(G(\tau_T)) \subseteq E(G(\tau^m_{T'}))$) iff for every vertex N of $G(\tau_T)$, $V^m(N) \neq T'$, where $T' = T \cap Max(M)$.

case (3): Set $R := \mathbb{Q} \bigoplus \Pi_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{Z}/p_iZ$. Then $Max(R) = \{p_iR, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $Spec(R) = Max(R) \cup \{(\mathbf{0}) \bigoplus \Pi_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{Z}/p_iZ\}$.
For every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \neq j$, $I_i = \mathbb{Q} \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}/p_iZ$ and $I_j = \mathbb{Q} \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}/p_jZ$ are not adjacent in $G(\tau_{Spec(R)})$, but they are adjacent in $G(\tau^m_{Max(R)})$. This example shows that $G(\tau^m_{Max(R)})$ is not a subgraph of $G(\tau_{Spec(R)})$.

The following theorem illustrates some graphical parameters.

Theorem 3.6. *The Zariski topology-graph $G(\tau_T^m)$ is connected and $diam(G(\tau_T^m)) \leq 3$. Moreover if $G(\tau_T^m)$ containing a cycle satisfies $gr(G(\tau_T^m)) \leq 4$.*

Proof. Use the technique of [4, Theorem 2.10]. □

Proposition 3.7. Let M be an R-module and let $\psi : Max(M) \to Max(\overline{R})$ be the natural map. Suppose $Max(M)$ is homeomorphic to $Max(\overline{R})$ under ψ. Let N and L be adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$ and let $T' = \{\overline{P : M} : P \in T\}$. Then $\overline{N : M}$ and $\overline{L : M}$ are adjacent in $G(\tau_{T'}^m)$. Conversely, if $\overline{I}$ and $\overline{J}$ are adjacent in $G(\tau_{T'}^m)$, then IM and JM are adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to [4, Proposition 2.11]. □

Lemma 3.8. Let $G(\tau_T^m) \neq \emptyset$ and let $P \in T$. Then P is a vertex if each of the following statements holds.

(a) There exists a subset T' of T such that $P \in T'$, $V^m(\bigcap_{Q\in T'} Q) = T$, and $V^m(\bigcap_{Q\in T', Q\neq P} Q) \neq T$. In particular, this holds when T is a finite set and every element of T is adjacent to a semi maximal submodule of M.
(b) For a submodule N of M, $N \in V(G(\tau_T^m))$ and $N \cup P \notin V(G(\tau_T^m))$.

Proof. Straightforward. □

Definition 3.9. We define a subgraph $G_d(\tau_T^m)$ of $G(\tau_T^m)$ with vertices $V((G_d(\tau_T^m))= \{N < M :$ there exists $L < M$ such that $V^m(N) \cup V^m(L) = T$ and $V^m(N), V^m(L) \neq T$ and $V^m(N) \cup V^m(L) = \emptyset\}$, where distinct vertices N and L are adjacent if and only if $V^m(N) \cup V^m(L) = T$ and $V^m(N) \cup V^m(L) = \emptyset$. It is clear that the degree of each $N \in V((G_d(\tau_T^m))$ is the number of submodules K of M such that $V^m(K) = V^m(L)$, where N and L are adjacent.

Lemma 3.10. (a) $G_d(\tau_T) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $T = V^m(\Im(T))$ and T is disconnected.

(b) Suppose $Spec(M) = Max(M)$ and M is a Max-surjective module and T is closed. Then $G_d(\tau_T^m) = \emptyset$ if and only if $R/(\Im(T) : M)$ contains no idempotent other than $\overline{0}$ and $\overline{1}$.

Proof. (a) is straightforward and (b) follows from [6, Proposition 2.9] and [15, Corollary 3.8]. □

Theorem 3.11. *$G_d(\tau_T^m)$ is a bipartite graph.*

Proof. Use the technique of [4, Theorem 2.17]. □

Corollary 3.12. By Theorem 3.11, if $G_d(\tau_T^m)$ contains a cycle, then $gr(G_d(\tau_T^m)) = 4$.

Example 3.13. Set $M := \mathbb{Z}/12\mathbb{Z}$. Then $Max(M) = \{2\mathbb{Z}/12\mathbb{Z}, 3\mathbb{Z}/12\mathbb{Z}\}$. Set $T = Max(M)$. Clearly, $G(\tau_T^m) = G_d(\tau_T^m)$ is a bipartite graph and $\mathbb{Z}/(\cup_{P\in T} P : M) \cong \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ contains idempotents other than $\overline{0}$ and $\overline{1}$.

Example 3.14. Set $M := \mathbb{Z}/30\mathbb{Z}$. Then $Max(M) = \{2\mathbb{Z}/30\mathbb{Z}, 3\mathbb{Z}/30\mathbb{Z}, 5\mathbb{Z}/30\mathbb{Z}\}$. Set $T = Max(M)$. Clearly, $G_d(\tau_T)$ is a bipartite graph and $\mathbb{Z}/(\bigcap_{P\in T} P : M) \cong \mathbb{Z}/30\mathbb{Z}$ contains idempotents other than $\overline{0}$ and $\overline{1}$.

The Example 3.14 shows that $G_d(\tau_T^m)$ is not necessarily connected. The following proposition provides some useful characterization for this case.

Proposition 3.15. (a) $G_d(\tau_T^m)$ with two parts U and V is a complete bipartite graph if and only if for every $N, L \in U$ (resp. in V), $V^m(N) = V^m(L)$.
(b) $G_d(\tau_T^m)$ is connected if and only if it is a complete bipartite graph.

Proof. Use the fact that if N, L are two vertices, then $d(N, L) = 2$ if and only if $V^m(N) = V^m(L)$. □

4. The relationship between $G(\tau_T^m)$ and $AG(M)$

The purpose of this section is to illustrate the connection between the Zariski topology-graph on the maximal spectrum of a module and the annihilating-submodule graph.

Theorem 4.1. *Let M be a Max-surjective module and suppose N and L are adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$. Then $J^m((N : M)M)/\Im(T)$ and $J^m((L : M)M)/\Im(T)$ are adjacent in $AG(M/\Im(T))$.*

Proof. Assume that N and L are adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$ so that $V^m(N) \cup V^m(L) = T$. Then we have $V^{*m}(((N : M)M)((L : M)M))) = T$.
It implies that $J^m(((N : M)M)((L : M)M)) = \Im(T)$. Hence we have $\Im(T) \subseteq J^m((N : M)M)$ and $\Im(T) \subseteq J^m((L : M)M)$. Now it is enough to show that

$J^m((N : M)M)J^m((L : M)M) = (J^m((N : M)M) : M)(J^m((L : M)M) : M)M \subseteq$

$\Im(T)$.
Since M is Max-surjective, by [5, Lemma 3.11(a)], we have $(J^m((N : M)M) : M) = J^m(((N : M)M : M)) = J^m((N : M))$ and $(J^m((L : M)M) : M) = J^m((L : M))$. By using [13, Proposition 2], it turns out that

$$(J^m((N : M)M) : M)(J^m((L : M)M) : M)M = J^m((N : M))J^m((L : M)))M \subseteq$$

$$J((N : M)(L : M))M \subseteq J^m((N : M)(L : M)M) = J^m(NL) = \Im(T).$$

Note that if $J^m((N : M)M) = \Im(T)$ or $J^m((N : M)M) = J^m((L : M)M)$, then we have $(N : M)M \subseteq \Im(T)$. This implies that $V^m(N) = T$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 4.2. Assume that the hypothesis hold as in Theorem 4.1. Then $J^m(N)/\Im(T)$ and $J^m(L)/\Im(T)$ are adjacent in $AG(M/\Im(T))$.

Proof. By meeting the above theorem again, we see that $V^{*m}(NL) = T$, $J^m(NL) = \Im(T)$, and

$$J^m(N)J^m(L) = J^m(N : M)J^m(L : M)M \subseteq \ J^m(NL) = \Im(T).$$

□

Proposition 4.3. Suppose $M/\Im(T)$ is not a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. Then we have the following.

(a) The annihilating-submodule graph $AG(M/\Im(T))$ is isomorphic to a subgraph of $G(\tau_T^m)$.
(b) If M is a Max-surjective module or $Spec(M) = Max(M)$, then $AG(M/\Im(T)) = \emptyset$ if and only if $G(\tau_T^m) = \emptyset$.
(c) If R is an Artinian ring and $M/\Im(T)$ is a finitely generated module, then for every non-zero proper submodule $N/\Im(T)$ of $M/\Im(T)$, $N/\Im(T)$ and N are vertices in $AG(M/\Im(T))$ and $G(\tau_T^m)$, respectively.

Proof. Let us begin our proof by noting that $M/\Im(T)$ is a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$ if and only if there exists $N < M$ containing $\Im(T)$ properly with $V^m(N) = T$.

(a) Let $N/\Im(T) \in V(AG(M/\Im(T)))$. Then there exists a nonzero submodule $L/\Im(T)$ of $M/\Im(T)$ such that it is adjacent to $N/\Im(T)$ ($N \neq L$, because $M/\Im(T)$

is not a vertex). So we have $NL \subseteq \Im(T)$. Hence $V^m(NL) = T$. If $V^m(N) = T$, then $(N : M) = (\Im(T) : M)$. It follows that $M/\Im(T)$ is a vertex, a contradiction. Hence N is a vertex in $G(\tau_T^m)$ which is adjacent to L. In particular, if $M = R$ and $\Im(T) = 0$, then $AG(R)$ is a subgraph of $G(\tau_{Max(M)})$.

(b) To see the forward implication, let $AG(M/\Im(T)) = \emptyset$. Then $M/\Im(T)$ is a prime R-module so that $\Im(T)$ is a prime submodule of M. Thus we have $G(\tau_T^m) = \emptyset$. Conversely, suppose that $AG(M/\Im(T)) \neq \emptyset$. Then by part (a), $AG(M/\Im(T))$ is isomorphic to a subgraph of $G(\tau_T^m)$. Hence $G(\tau_T^m) \neq \emptyset$, as desired.

(c) This follows from Proposition D and part (a). □

We need the following theorem from [17, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 4.4. *Let M be a finitely generated module and let N be a submodule of M such that $(N : M) \subseteq P$, where P is a prime ideal of R. Then there exists a prime submodule K of M such that $N \subseteq K$ and $(K : N) = P$.*

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose $N/\Im(T)$ and $L/\Im(T)$ are adjacent in $M/\Im(T)$. Then N and L are adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$ if one of the following conditions holds.*

(a) *$M/\Im(T)$ is not a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. In particular, this holds when $M/\Im(T)$ is finitely generated and contains no semi maximal submodule $S \neq \Im(T)$ with $V(S) = T$.*
(b) *M/N and M/L are Max-surjective and they contain no semi maximal submodule $S \neq \Im(T)$ with $V(S) = T$.*

Proof. (a) This follows from Proposition 4.3 (a). For the proof of the second assertion, suppose $M/\Im(T)$ is a vertex. So there exists a non-zero proper submodule $N'/\Im(T)$ of $M/\Im(T)$, where $N' < M$, such that $V^m(N') = T$. It is clear that $M/\Im(T)$ has a structure of $R/(\Im(T) : M)$-module. Let Q be an arbitrary element of T. Then we have $(N'/\Im(T) : M/\Im(T)) \subseteq (Q : M)/(\Im(T) : M)$. Now by Theorem 4.5, there exists a prime submodule $K/\Im(T)$ such that $N' \subseteq K$ and $(K : M) = (Q : M)$. It follows that $N' \subseteq \Im(T)$, a contradiction.

(c) Clearly, $V^m(N) \cup V^m(L) = T$. Now let $V^m(N) = T$. Then we have $(N : M) \subseteq (Q : M)$ for every $Q \in T$. Since M/N is Max-surgective, there exists a maximal submodule K of M such that $N \subseteq K$ and $(K : M) = (Q : M)$. Hence $N \subseteq \Im(T)$, contrary to our assumption. So $V^m(N) \neq T$ and the proof is completed. □

Now we put the following lemma which is needed later. Its proof is easy and is omitted.

Lemma 4.6. Let $N \leq M$ and let $dim(R) = 0$. Then $rad(N) = N$ if and only if $Nil(R)M = 0$ (we recall that $Nil(R) = \sqrt{0}$ is the ideal consisting of the nilpotent elements of R).

Proposition 4.7. Suppose $dim(R) = 0$, $Nil(R)M = 0$, and $M/\Im(T)$ is not a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. Then the Zariski topology-graph $G(\tau_T^m)$ and the annihilating-submodule graph $AG(M/\Im(T))$ are isomorphic. In particular, when $M/\Im(T)$ is not a prime module, $G(\tau_T^m)$ has acc (resp. dcc) on vertices if and only if $M/\Im(T)$ is a Noetherian (resp. an Artinian) module.

Proof. By Proposition 4.3 (a), It thus remains to show that $G(\tau_T^m)$ is isomorphic with a subgraph of $AG(M/\Im(T))$. Suppose N and L are adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$. So we

have $V^m(NL) = T$. From [10, Theorem 2.3], we have $rad(N) = N$ if and only if $J^m(N) = N$. Now by Lemma 4.6, $J^m(NL) = NL$. Hence $N/\Im(T)$ and $L/\Im(T)$ are adjacent in $AG(M/\Im(T))$ as required. The second assertion follows from Theorem E. □

Lemma 4.8. Assume that $M/\Im(T)$ is not a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. Suppose that for every $Q \in T\bigcap V(G(\tau_T^m))$, there exists a semi maximal submodule of M such that it is adjacent to Q. Then $Max(M)\bigcap V(G(\tau_T^m)) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $Max(M/\Im(T))\bigcap V(AG(M/\Im(T))) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Choose $Q \in Max(M)$ and $Q \in V(G(\tau_T^m))$. By assumption,

$$V^m(Q)\bigcup V^m(\bigcap_{Q\in T'} Q) = T,$$

where T' is a subset of T. Then $Q/\Im(T)$ and $\bigcap_{Q\in T'} Q/\Im(T)$ are adjacent in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. To see the backward implication, suppose $Q/\Im(T)$ is a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. So there exists a submodule $N/\Im(T)$ of $M/\Im(T)$ which is adjacent to it. It follows that Q and N are adjacent in $G(\tau_T^m)$ and the proof is completed. □

Proposition 4.9. Suppose that for every $mM \in T\bigcap V(G(\tau_T^m))$, there exists a semi maximal submodule of M such that it is adjacent to mM, where $m \in Max(R)$. Then we have exactly one of the following assertions.

(a) There exists a non-zero submodule K of M with $K \neq \Im(T)$ and $V^m(K) = T$.
(b) There exists a maximal ideal m of R such that $mM \in T\bigcap V(G(\tau_T^m))$ if and only if $Soc(M/\Im(T)) \neq 0$.

Proof. An obvious way to do this is to suppose (a) doesn't hold and we have $mM \in T\bigcap V(G(\tau_T^m))$, where m is a maximal ideal of R. Then by Lemma 4.8, $mM/\Im(T)$ is a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. It is clear that $M/\Im(T)$ is not a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. Thus by Proposition G, $Soc(M/\Im(T)) \neq 0$. Conversely, let $Soc(M/\Im(T)) \neq 0$. Then by Proposition G, $mM/\Im(T) \in V(AG(M/\Im(T)))$, where m is a maximal ideal of R. Hence by Lemma 4.8, $mM \in V(G(\tau_T^m))$ and the proof is completed.

□

Theorem 4.10. *Assume that $M/\Im(T)$ is a faithful module which is not a vertex in $AG(M/\Im(T))$. Then the following assertions are equivalent.*

(a) *$G(\tau_T^m)$ is a finite graph.*
(b) *$AG(M/\Im(T))$ is a finite graph*
(c) *$M/\Im(T)$ has finitely many submodules. Moreover, $G(\tau_T^m)$ has n ($n \geq 1$) vertices if and only if $M/\Im(T)$ has only n nonzero proper submodules.*

Proof. $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ This follows from Proposition 4.3 (a).

$(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ Suppose $AG(M/\Im(T))$ is a finite graph with n vertices ($n \geq 1$). By Theorem E, $M/\Im(T)$ has finite length. Now the claim follows from Proposition D.

$(c) \Rightarrow (a)$ $M/\Im(T)$ has finite length so that $dim(R) = 0$. Also, it follows from the hypothesis that $Nil(R) = 0$. Therefore, $G(\tau_T^m)$ is a finite graph by Proposition 4.7. The second assertion follows easily from the above arguments. □

The following example shows that the hypotheses "$M/\Im(T)$ is a faithful module" is needed in the above theorem.

Example 4.11. Consider Example 3.5 (case (1)). When $|T| \geq 2$ and

$$T \subseteq \{p_1\mathbb{Z}\bigoplus\mathbb{Z}, \ldots, p_n\mathbb{Z}\bigoplus\mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Then every element T is a vertex and $G(\tau_T^m)$ is an infinite graph because $p_i^k\mathbb{Z}\bigoplus\mathbb{Z}$ is a vertex for every positive integer k and $1 \leq i \leq n$. Now we have

$$R/\Im(T) = \mathbb{Z}\bigoplus\mathbb{Z}/(p_1p_2\ldots p_k\mathbb{Z})\bigoplus\mathbb{Z}.$$

It follows that $AG(R/\Im(T))$ is a finite graph.

We end this work with the following question:

Question 4.12. Let $G(\tau_T^m) \neq \emptyset$, where T be an infinite subset of $Max(M)$. Is $T\bigcap V(G(\tau_T^m)) \neq \emptyset$?

References

[1] D.F. Anderson, P.S., Livingston, *The zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring*. J. Algebra **217** Springer,(1999) NJ:434-447.

[2] W. Anderson, K.R. Fuller, *Rings and Categories of Modules*. New York-Heidelberg-Berlin:Springer-Verlag (1974).

[3] H. Ansari-Toroghy, F. Farshadifar, *Product and dual product of submodules*. Far East J. Math. Sci **25 (3)**(2007) 447-455.

[4] H. Ansari-Toroghy, Sh. Habibi, *The Zariski topology-graph of modules over commutative rings*, Comm. Algebra, **42**(2014) 3283-3296.

[5] H. Ansari-Toroghy, S. Keyvani, *On the maximal spectrum of a module and Zariski topology*, Bull. Malays. Sci. Soc, **38**(2015) 303-316.

[6] H. Ansari-Toroghy, R. Ovlyaee-Sarmazdeh, *On the prime spectrum of a module over a commutative Noetherian ring*. Honam. Math. J **29**(2007) 351-366.

[7] ———, *On the prime spectrum of* x*-injective modules*. Comm. Algebra. **38**(2010) 2606-2621.

[8] ———, *On the prime spectrum of a module and Zariski topologies*. Comm. Algebra. **38**(2010) 4461-4475.

[9] ———, *Modules for which the natural map of the maximal spectrum is surjective*, Colloq. Math, 119 (2010) 217-227.

[10] M. Behboodi, O.A.S. Karamzadeh and H. Koohy, *Modules whose certain ideals are prime*, Vietnam J. Math. **32** (2004) 303-317

[11] M. Behboodi, Z. Rakeei, *The annihilating-ideal graph of commutative rings I*. J. Algebra Appl. **10**, no. 4(2011) 727-739.

[12] Chin-Pi. Lu, *Prime submodules of modules*. Comment. Math. Univ. St. Pauli **33**, no. 1(1984) 61-69.

[13] ———, *M-radicals of submodules in modules*. Math. Japonica **34** , no. 2(1989) 211-219.

[14] ———, *Spectra of modules*. Comm. Algebra **23**, no. 10(1995) 3741-3752.

[15] ———, *The Zariski topology on the prime spectrum of a module*. Houston J. Math. **25**, no. 3(1999) 417-432.

[16] ———, *A module whose prime spectrum has the surjective natural map*. Houston J. Math. **33**, no. 1(2007) 125-143.

[17] R. L. McCasland, M.E. Moor, *Prime submodules*. Comm. Algebra **20 (6)**(1992) 1803-1817.

[18] Diestel. Reinard, *Graph Theory*. Grad, Texts in Math, Springer, NJ (2005).

Department of pure Mathematics, Faculty of mathematical Sciences, University of Guilan, P. O. Box 41335-19141 Rasht, Iran.
E-mail address: ansari@guilan.ac.ir

Department of pure Mathematics, Faculty of mathematical Sciences, University of Guilan, P. O. Box 41335-19141 Rasht, Iran.
E-mail address: sh.habibi@phd.guilan.ac.ir